

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 2, 22, 42, and 46 are requested to be canceled.

Claims 1, 21, 41, and 45 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 3-16, 18, 20-21, 23-36, 38, 40-41, 43-45, and 47-48 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claims 1-3, 7-16, 18, 20-23, 27-36, 38, 40-42, and 45-46 (Eck and Bhatt)

Claims 1-3, 7-16, 18, 20-23, 27-36, 38, 40-42, and 45-46 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0129059) in view of Bhatt (U.S. Patent No. 6,799,184).

Preliminarily, Applicants note that Bhatt is only prior art based on the priority claim to the provisional application filed on June 21, 2001. Since the provisional application is unavailable, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner certify that the disclosure relied upon in Bhatt is actually disclosed in the provisional application.

Claims 1, 21, 41, and 45 have been amended to incorporate the recitations of canceled claims 2, 22, 42, and 46, respectively.

Claim 1, as amended, recites that a method for translating between an XML-type document and a first type of document comprises, *inter alia*, generating a data model for the XML-type document based on an XML data source, generating a data model for the first type of document based on the XML data source, creating mapping rules between the data model for the XML-type document and the data model for the first type of document, creating an

executable file to effect the translation between the XML-type document and the first type of document based on the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document and the mapping rules, and running the executable file to translate between the XML-type document and the first type of document.

In the rejection of claim 2, it is asserted that Eck discloses creating an executable file to effect the translation between the XML-type document and the first type of document based on the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document and the mapping rules, and running the executable file to translate between the XML-type document and the first type of document in ¶ [0003]. This paragraph discloses the following:

Briefly, the present invention solves the foregoing problems by providing a method for automatically generating an XML map comprising the steps of: receiving an XML environment; creating a target model and a source model in accordance with predetermined rules, with one of the models being an XML model and the other of the models being a flat file or data base model; creating business rules for moving data from a source file to a target file for a plurality of defining items in the source model; **creating a run file with file names for generating the map.**

* ¶ [0003] (emphasis added)

As indicated by the highlighted portion, Eck discloses creating a file for generating the map. In contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites creating an executable file to effect the translation between the XML-type document and the first type of document based on the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document and the mapping rules. Thus, whereas the run file in Eck merely creates a map, the executable file of claim 1 effects the actual translation between the documents based on the mapping rules. Accordingly, Eck fails to disclose or suggest creating the executable file to effect the translation between documents and running the executable file to translate them.

Even if combinable, Bhatt fails to cure the deficiencies of Eck. Like Eck, Bhatt fails to disclose or suggest creating an executable file to effect the translation between the XML-type document and the first type of document based on the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document and the mapping rules, and running the executable file to translate between the XML-type document and the first

type of document. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Eck and Bhatt.

Claims 3, 7-16, 18, and 20 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Eck and Bhatt by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 21, 41, and 45 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Eck and Bhatt for reasons analogous to claim 1. Claims 23, 27-36, 38, and 40 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Eck and Bhatt by virtue of their dependence from claim 21, as well as their additional recitations.

2. Claims 4-6, 24-26, 43-44, and 47-48 (Eck, Bhatt, Webber, Huang, and De La Huerga)

The remaining claims 4-6, 24-26, 43-44, and 47-48 were rejected by the combination of Eck and Bhatt and further in view of Webber (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,400), Huang (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0147748), or De La Huerga (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,321). Like Eck and Bhatt, none of these references discloses or suggests creating an executable file to effect the translation between the XML-type document and the first type of document based on the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document and the mapping rules, and running the executable file to translate between the XML-type document and the first type of document. Accordingly, even if combinable, claims 4-6, 24-26, 43-44, and 47-48 are patentably distinguishable from the asserted combinations by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 21, 41, and 45, respectively, as well as their additional recitations.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated,

otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2007

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Marc K. Weinstein
Registration No. 43,250

Customer Number: 22428

Attorneys for Applicants